Limited Visual Dam Safety Inspections

OA00045

Helemano 16 Reservoir

Oahu, Hawaii

Prepared by:

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
HONOLULU DISTRICT

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES

May 2006

Dam ID: HI00045
Name: Helemano 16 Reservoir

Limited Visual Dam Safety Inspection Conducted on: 3 April 2006

I. Purpose:

Due to disaster occurrences of periodic heavy rains and flooding, which has caused extensive damage to property and loss of lives, the Governor has issued a State of Emergency Proclamation extending from February 20, 2006 to April 9, 2006. In light of the tragic failure of the Kaloko dam on Kauai and the continued forecast of heavy rains, emergency inspections of all regulated dams in all counties are being undertaken.

These inspections are for the purpose of determining if any of the regulated dams and reservoirs in the City and County of Honolulu, Maui County or Hawaii County, are suspect for immediate concern to the downstream area under the prolonged conditions of heavy rain showers.

II. Authority

Inspections were authorized under the Hawaii Dam Safety Act of 1987, Chapter 179D "Dams and Reservoirs" of Hawaii Revised Statues, and Title 13, Subtitle 7, Chapter 190, "Dams and Reservoirs" of the Hawaii Administrative Rules.

These inspections were conducted under joint agreements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACE), the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and the State of Hawaii. The Memorandum of Agreement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is entered into pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 3036(d)(2), and the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act (31 U.S.C. §6505), and established via support agreement number DL-06-01.

III. Scope

Visual inspection was performed on parts of the embankment and appurtenant works readily available and visible for inspection by the inspection team at the time of the inspection. Such parts and appurtenant works included the upstream slope, crest, downstream slope, abutments and toes, outlet works, and spillway.

On the date of this limited visual inspection, there may or may not have appeared to be any immediate threat to the safety of the dam, however no assurance can be made regarding the dam's condition after this date. Subsequent adverse weather and other factors may affect the dam's condition.

IV. Limitations of Findings and Recommendations

The inspection is based only on visible features/areas of the dam on the day of inspection. The inspection does not entail detailed stability, hydrologic, hydraulic, or seismic investigations. This inspection is not a formal phase I or phase II dam safety inspection and does not include a review or evaluation from each specialist of an inspection team, such as a geologists, civil, geotechnical, structural, or hydraulics engineer. The owner should verify the findings of this report and take corrective actions. The owner may submit to the State alternative corrective actions that are certified by a licensed professional engineer in the State of Hawaii experienced in the design and construction of dams. This inspection does not relieve the owner/operator from their responsibility to conduct routine inspections, maintenance, repairs, modifications, monitoring, documentation, and/or investigative studies.

V. Inspection Team

Organization	Name
State of Hawaii, Dept. of Land and Natural Resources	Carty Chang
National Resource Conservation Service	Mike Hayama
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Ray Kong

VI. Owner's Representatives Present

Mr. Gary Parcellus, representative of Dole Foods, Inc.

VII. Summary Report Team

Organization	Name
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Mr. Derek Chow
	Mr. Joseph Koester
State of Hawaii, Dept. of Land and Natural Resources	Ms. Denise Manuel
	Mr. Edwin Matsuda

VIII. Dam Type

The dam is an earthen embankment.

IX. Dam Classification

The current hazard classification of this dam is: Unclassified
Based on available data, this classification is believed to still be applicable.

Hazard Potential Classification based on the following:

Category	Loss of Life	Economic Loss
Low	None Expected	Minimal (undeveloped to occasional structures or agriculture)
Significant	Few (No Urban development and no more than a small number of inhabitable structures)	Appreciable (Notable agriculture, industry or structures)
High	More than a few	Extensive community, industry or agriculture.

Based on inventoried storage and height data, the size classification of the dam is: Small

Size Classification based on the following:

Category	Storage (Acre-Feet)	Height (feet)
Small	< 1000	< 40
Intermediate	> 1000 and < 50,000	> 40 and < 100
Large	> 50,000	> 100

Dam ID: HI00045
Name: Helemano 16 Reservoir

X. Summary of Inspection:

Condition Rating Criteria: The conditional terms in this report are used to generally described the conditions below. Inspections, monitoring, and additional investigations are considered to be incidental to all condition ratings.

Satisfactory	Expected to fulfill intended function.
Fair	Expected to fulfill intended function, but maintenance is recommended.
Poor	May not fulfill intended function; maintenance or repairs are necessary.
Unsatisfactory	Is not expected to fulfill intended function; repair, replacement, or modification is necessary.
Unknown	Not visible, not accessible, not inspected, or unable to determine the condition rating based on the observation taken.

A. General appearance:

Some of the reservoir and dam features were not easily recognizable due to vegetation. There were no signs of any recent modifications. The reservoir appeared to have a small surface drainage area. Based on staff personnel, this reservoir has no history of incidents.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

a. The Owner shall maintain documentations including improvements, modifications, Operations and Maintenance Manuals and routine inspection logs for this dam facility.
b. An EAP is recommended for all dams regardless of hazard class. Submit EAP if developed for the facility.
c. Submit narrative and additional information detailing known improvements, modifications, and/or alterations at the dam site, unless covered by approved dam permit.
d. Routine inspection logs were not inspected.
e. Dam owners shall provide for routine inspection of the dam.
f. The dam did not appear to be maintained on a regular basis.
g. Access to site appears to be satisfactory.
h. Provide a detailed narrative of the any recalled incident, responses taken, and any damages incurred. Dam owners are required to promptly advise the department of any sudden or unprecedented flood or unusual or alarming circumstance or occurrences which may adversely affect the dam or reservoir.
i. Submit current Operations and Maintenance Manual or Procedures for this dam / reservoir facility.
j. Submit Site or Facility Map of this Dam which identifies the location of major features including outlet works controls and conduits.
k. Emergency Alarms / Monitors. There were no alarms or monitors observed on this reservoir.

l. Power / Communication. There were no communication systems observed on this reservoir.

B. Access / Security:

Access to the dam was accomplished via a County roadway.
A four wheel drive vehicle is not required except maybe during severe weather conditions.

Security issue. Access to the dam is via gates.

C. Inflow Works:

The inflow works were not observed. However according to staff personnel, there is one inlet feeding the reservoir. This is via a culvert.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

a. The intake works were not inspected.
b. The intake works were not tested.

D. Reservoir

The reservoir level during the inspection was approximately 8-feet below the crest elevation. According to staff personnel, the reservoir has not been used for years.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

a. The reservoir was inspected only along the vicinity of the dam. Other areas were not visible due to heavy vegetation.
b. The reservoir appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
c. A staff gage was not observed at the reservoir. Provide some method of quantifying the water level within the reservoir.

E. Upstream Slope (Fair/Poor)

The upstream slope appeared to be at a 1V:1H (Vertical/Horizontal) slope.
There was no slope protection observed.
Erosions were not observed, the slope was not entirely visible.
Cracks were not observed, the slope was not entirely visible.
Sinkholes were not observed, the slope was not entirely visible.
The upstream slope was not entirely visible due to heavy woody and grass vegetation.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

a. The upstream slope was not fully inspected due to heavy vegetation.
b. The upstream slope appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
c. The upstream slope was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.

F. Crest: (Satisfactory)

The dam crest was approximately 30-feet wide
There was a dirt access road on top of the crest.
Minor erosion was observed, limited primarily to tire ruts and some small gullies from surface drainage flowing down the downstream slope.
Vegetation was observed on the edges of the crest. These were primarily tall grass.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

a. The dam crest appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.

G. Downstream Slope: (Fair)

The downstream slope was in fair condition and not visible for the most part due to heavy vegetation. The slope was very steep, around a 1V to 1H slope or steeper. There was no access to the downstream slope, or roadway along the downstream toe. There was no slope protection observed on the downstream slope.
Erosion was not observed on the downstream slope, however the slope was not entirely visible. Cracks were observed perpendicular to crest.
Sinkholes were not observed on the downstream slope, however the slope was not entirely visible.
Vegetation was observed on the downstream slope. The majority of the vegetation was bushes with some woody trees.
Seepage was not observed on the downstream toe, however the toe area was not visible.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

a. The downstream slope appeared to be in fair condition and requires evaluation.
b. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: Downstream slope ½:1 should be evaluated.
c. A crack was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and / or repair as required.
d. The down stream slope was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
e. Tree(s) were observed on the downstream slope. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause severe damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2” diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
f. The slope was very steep, around a 1 to 1 slope, further study is required to verify slope stability.

H. Abutments / Toe: (Unknown)

The abutments and toe were not entirely visible or identifiable due to heavy vegetative growth.
Erosion along the abutment or toe was not visible.
Cracks in either direction were not observed, however the abutment and toe was not entirely visible.
There was heavy vegetation along the abutments and toe locations.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

a. The abutments/toe were not inspected. Not accessible.
b. The abutments/toe appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
c. The abutment/toe area was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
d. Tree(s) were observed along the abutment/toe. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause severe damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.

I. Outlet Works: (Unknown)

No access was observed so the outlet works was not inspected or tested.
The heavy vegetation should be removed and maintained low to enable easy visual inspection. It has not been used for years according to the staff personnel.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

a. The outlet works were not inspected.
b. The outlet works were not tested.
c. The outlet works appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
d. Operability of outlet works should be verified.

J. Spillway: (Fair/Poor)

This spillway consisted of a concrete lined channel adjacent to the right abutment.
The rough dimensions were 12-feet wide by 8-feet deep.
The spillway approach had tall grass growing in it.
Erosion observed near the spillway.
There was heavy vegetation along the downstream channel.
Further investigations should be conducted to conclude the capacity of the spillway.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

a. The Spillway appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.

b. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: Provide protection against erosion observed.
c. The spillway approach was partially blocked with vegetation. Clear approach.
d. Severe scour erosion was observed which requires maintenance and/or repair. Description: Erosion observed at downstream end of the lined spillway.
e. Unclear if spillway is adequately sized. Spillway should pass the probable maximum flood. Verify spillway capacity and take corrective action as required.

K. Down Stream Channel: (Unknown)
The down stream channel was not investigated.

Findings and Corrective Actions:
a. The downstream channel was not inspected due to inaccessibility.

XI. Additional Comments:

Original field inspection notes were scanned and are attached to this summary report. Included are several photos from the site visit to detail important features of the project, captioned to be self-explanatory.

Per e-mail dated 5/12/06, 3:47 pm from Ray Kong, USACE

Please describe vehicle access to site: Standard car okay.

Please describe access during rains: Recommend 4-wheel drive.

Please describe access when spillway is flowing:
Depends on weather, standard car usually, 4-wheel during heavy rains.

Reservoir: Please indicate corrective action.
No staff gage found, this is therefore an action item for the owner to provide. This reservoir is not being used and the owner may want to breach it.

Intake Works: Not inspected.

Downstream Slope:
Please indicate if the downstream slope is 1V on 1H or 1V on 2H slope. There are two different slope dimensions, one on the typical and the other in the corrective action.
Appears to be 1V on 1H but could have areas steeper. In any case, the slope stability should be evaluated.

Comments:
No immediate threat observed on the day of inspection. All areas not inspected due to heavy vegetation and no accessibility should be made accessible (vegetation removed) for a re-inspection by qualified personnel.

PHOTOGRAPHS

Dam ID: HI00045
Name: Helemano 16 Reservoir

View of reservoir

View of upstream slope

Dam ID: HI00045
Name: Helemano 16 Reservoir

Another view of the upstream slope

View of the downstream slope

Dam ID: HI00045
Name: Helemano 16 Reservoir

Another view of the downstream slope

Another view of the downstream slope

Dam ID: HI00045
Name: Helemano 16 Reservoir

View of downstream slope showing trees and heavy vegetation

View of the spillway looking upstream

Dam ID: HI00045
Name: Helemano 16 Reservoir

View of spillway looking upstream; notice erosion where lining ends



View of outlet works; has not been used for years

FIELD INSPECTION SHEETS

Dam ID: OA-0045
HELEMANO 16 RESERVOIR

Vulnerability Index:
Extreme 1 | High 2 | Moderate 3 | Low 4

Inspection No: _____
Date: 3 April 2006

STATE OF HAWAII - DLNR
DAM SAFETY INSPECTION SHEET

Inspection Type: Visual Dam Safety Inspection

Persons Present	Affiliation	Phone Number
Ray Kong	US Army Corps of Engineers	
Carty Chang	DLNR	
Mike Hayama	NRCS	
Gary Parcellus	Dole	

Weather Condition: ☐ Rain previous day ☐ Rainy ☐ Drizzle / Mist ☐ Cloudy/Overcast ☐ Partly Cloudy ☑ Sunny ☐ Dry

Comments: _____

---

1. General: *(Information currently on file, update as required)*

Dam/Res. Name: HELEMANO 16 RESERVOIR
Owner: Dole Food Company Hawaii *(C005)*
Owner Contact: Mr. Gary Paracuellas — Owner Ph.: _____
Lessee: _____ — Lessee Ph.: _____
O & M Contractor: _____ — O & M Ph.: _____
Nearest Town: KEMOO CAMP 4 — Latitude: 21.5583° (decimal)
County: HONOLULU — Longitude: 159.07° (decimal)
Tax Map Key(s): (1)6-4-003:001

Dam Status	A:	Hazard Potential	U:	Dam Size	
Year Completed	1955	Dam Length	300 ft.	Dam Height	17 ft.
Normal Storage	55 ac.ft.	Max. Storage	65 ac.ft.	Max. Surface Area	0 ac.
Drainage Area	0 mi.	Spillway Type		Max. Spillway Q	0 cfs

Owner owns land under dam facility: _____
Emergency Action Plan on file with the Department: NO
Reports on file with the Department: None on file.

Dam ID: OA-0045
HELEMANO 16 RESERVOIR

Inspection No: _____
Date: 04/03/06

2. Questions for Owner's Rep.:	Yes	No	Unknown	Comments
Construction Plans Available	☐	☐	☑	
Site / Facility Map	☑	☐	☐	
Operation & Maintenance Manual	☐	☑	☐	
Emergency Action Plan	☐	☑	☐	
Modifications / Improvements	☐	☐	☑	
Conduct Routine Inspections	☑	☐	☐	
Conduct Routine Maintenance	☑	☐	☑	
Vehicle access to site	☑	☐	☐	☐ Not accessible ☐ With Standard car ☐ Requires 4-Wheel Drive
Access during heavy rains	☑	☐	☐	☐ Not accessible ☐ With Standard car ☐ Requires 4-Wheel Drive
Access when spillway is flowing	☑	☐	☐	☐ Not accessible ☐ With Standard car ☐ Requires 4-Wheel Drive
Other Studies Conducted	☐	☑	☐	☐ Phase I ☐ Phase II ☐ Hydraulics ☐ Stability ☐ Hazard ☐ Seismic ☐ Other: _____
Incident History	☐	☑	☐	☐ Breached ☐ Overtop ☐ Slide ☐ Down stream Flooding ☐ Other: _____
Reservoir's Current Use	☐	☐	☐	☐ Sediment ☐ Irrigation ☐ Recreation ☐ Flood Control ☐ Drinking Water ☐ Power Generation ☐ Other: Not currently being used. When in use-for irrigation

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- ☑ a. The Owner shall maintain documentations including Construction plans, specifications, improvements, modifications, Operations and Maintenance Manuals and routine inspection logs for this dam facility. 4/23/06 a
- ☐ b. An Emergency Action Plan (EAP) is on file with the department, submit any updates as applicable.
- ☐ c. An EAP is required for High Hazard Dams. Submit an updated EAP for this facility.
- ☑ d. An EAP is recommended for all dams regardless of hazard class. Submit EAP if developed for the facility. 4/23/06 a
- ☐ e. Submit narrative and additional information detailing the improvements, modifications, and/or alterations at the dam site, unless covered by approved dam permit.
- ☑ f. Routine inspection logs were not inspected.
- ☑ g. Dam owners shall provide for routine inspection of the dam.
- ☐ h. The dam did not appear to be maintained on a regular basis.
- ☑ i. Access to site appears to be satisfactory.
- ☐ j. There is no vehicular access to the dam site. Operational and emergency plans need to reflect this deficiency or access provided.
- ☐ k. Access to dam is questionable during severe weather conditions and/or spillway overflows. Operational plans and emergency plans need to reflect this deficiency or access provided.
- ☐ l. Provide a detailed narrative of the incident, responses taken, and any damages incurred. Dam owners are required to promptly advise the department of any sudden or unprecedented flood or unusual or alarming circumstance or occurrences which may adversely affect the dam or reservoir.
- ☑ m. Submit current Operations and Maintenance Manual or Procedures for this dam / reservoir facility. 4/23/06 a
- ☑ n. Submit Site or Facility Map of this Dam which identifies the location of major features including outlet works controls and conduits. 4/23/06 a
- ☐ o. _____

Additional Requirements:

The following investigative study(s) are:

Required	Recommended	
☐	☐	Phase I Study
☐	☐	Phase II Study (Including ☐ Seepage ☐ Hydrology/Hydraulics ☐ EAP)
☐	☐	Hydrology and Hydraulics (including Probable Maximum Flood and spillway capacity)
☐	☐	Stability Analysis
☐	☐	Seismic Analysis
☐	☐	Hazard Classification
☐	☐	Other: _____

Dam ID: OA-0045
HELEMANO 16 RESERVOIR

Inspection No: _____
Date: 04/03/06

Physical Dam Features: (Check All Applicable. Provide description of Items Observed and/or Take Photos. Indicate photo # in description.)

3. Reservoir:

Level during inspection _____ ft per _____ (gage / other) Approx 5' below crest

Normal Operating Level/Range _____ ft per _____ (gage / other) ~~Unknown~~ same

Description: _____

Typical Operation ☐ Spillway always flowing ☐ Kept within normal range ☐ Kept Empty ☐ Drained Daily ☐ Only filled by Storms ☒ Other: Not in use

Sinkhole in Res.: ☐ # Observed: _____ Size: _____ by _____ in. Deep ☐ Not Visible ☑ None Observed

Description: _____

Staff Gage: Description: none

Findings:

☐ a. The reservoir was not inspected.
☑ b. The reservoir appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☐ c. The reservoir appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ d. The reservoir appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition, urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

☐ e. The staff gage needs maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
☐ f. A staff gage was not observed at the reservoir. Provide some method of quantifying the water level within the reservoir.
☐ g. A sinkhole was observed in the upstream reservoir. Conduct additional investigations and monitoring to identify the cause, risk and appropriate action.
☐ h. _____

4. Intake Works Description:

☑ Number of Intakes 1

☑ Intake Culvert / Pipe

Size: _____ in. ☐ DIP ☐ Corrugated Metal ☐ PVC ☐ HDPE ☐ Concrete ☐ Other _____

Control: ☐ Gate ☐ Valve ☐ Flow can either be Shut off or Bypassed

From: ☐ Stream Diversion ☐ Pump ☐ Reservoir ☑ Other currently closed - not sure what type

☐ Ditch / Flume

Dimension: _____ (Size x Depth) Shape _____

Surface: ☐ Dirt ☐ Wood ☐ Concrete ☐ Lined w/ _____

Control: ☐ Gate ☐ Valve ☐ Flow can either be Shut off or Bypassed

From: ☐ Stream Diversion ☐ Pump ☐ Reservoir ☐ Other _____

Findings:

☑ a. The intake works were not inspected.
☐ b. The intake works were not tested.
☐ c. The intake works appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☐ d. The intake works appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ e. The intake works appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition, urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

☐ f. The intake works needs maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
☐ g. _____

Dam ID: OA-0045 HELEMANO 16 RESERVOIR	Inspection No: _____ Date: 04/03/06

5. Upstream Slope: (Typical Slope ± 1V : 1H)

Slope Protection: ☑ None ☐ Dumped Rock ☐ Fitted Rip Rap ☐ Grouted Rip Rap ☐ Liner _____ ☐ Other: _____

☐ Defect in Protection: Description: _____

Erosion: ☑ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☑ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☑ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Description: _____

Sinkholes: ☐ # Observed: _____ Size: _____ and _____ Depth ☐ Not Visible ☑ None Observed

Description: _____

Vegetation: ☐ None ☑ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees #_____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"

Description: Also dead tree roots

Findings:

- ☐ a. The upstream slope was not inspected.
- ☑ b. The upstream slope appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☐ c. The upstream slope appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ d. The upstream slope appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ e. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ f. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed on the slope, which requires maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ g. A crack was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.
- ☐ h. A sinkhole was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Repair and monitor the area.
- ☐ i. The upstream slope was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
- ☐ j. Tree(s) were observed on the dam embankment. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
- ☐ k. _____

Dam ID: OA-0045
HELEMANO 16 RESERVOIR

Inspection No: _____
Date: 04/03/04

6. Crest: Approximate Crest Width: 30'

Access: ☐ None ☐ Walking Path ☑ Roadway, Surface / Width / Usage: Dirt/30'/vehicle, pedestrian Access

Erosion: ☐ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☑ None Observed

Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☐ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☑ None Observed

Description: _____

Sinkholes: ☐ _____ in. Wide x _____ in. Long x _____ in. Deep ☐ Not Visible ☑ None Observed

Description: _____

Vegetation: ☑ None ☐ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees #_____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"

Description: _____

Findings:

- ☐ a. The dam crest was not inspected.
- ☑ b. The dam crest appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☐ c. The dam crest appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ d. The dam crest appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ e. Access along the crest was satisfactory.
- ☐ f. Access along the crest was not possible. Description: _____
- ☐ g. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed on the crest, which requires maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ h. A crack was observed on the crest, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.
- ☐ i. A sinkhole was observed on the crest, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Repair and monitor the area.
- ☐ j. Portions of the crest were not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
- ☐ k. Tree(s) were observed along the dam crest. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
- ☐ l. _____

Dam ID: OA-0045
HELEMANO 16 RESERVOIR

Inspection No: _____
Date: 04/03/06

7. Downstream Slope: (Typical Slope ± 1½ : 1H)

Access: ☐ lower roadway along toe ☐ roadway to outlet works ☐ walkway to outlet works ☑ None Observed

Slope Protection: ☑ None ☐ Dumped Rock ☐ Rip Rap ☐ Grouted Rip Rap ☐ Concrete

Erosion: ☑ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☑ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☑ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Description: _____

Sinkholes: ☐ _____ in. Wide x _____ in. Long x _____ in. Deep ☐ Not Visible ☑ None Observed

Description: _____

Vegetation: ☐ None ☑ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☑ Trees # 2 large ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"

Description: Numerous Hole Koa 2" diameter trunk size

Seepage:

Seep Spot Number 1

☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☑ None Observed

☐ Flowing, Description: _____

Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____

Description: _____

Seep Spot Number 2

☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

☐ Flowing, Description: _____

Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____

Description: _____

Findings:

☐ a. The downstream slope was not inspected.

☐ b. The downstream slope appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.

☑ c. The downstream slope appeared to be in fair ~~to poor~~ condition and requires ~~corrective action~~. Evaluation

☐ d. The downstream slope appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

☑ e. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: Downstream slope 1/2:1 should be evaluated

☐ f. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed on the slope, which requires maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____

☐ g. A crack was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.

☐ h. A sinkhole was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Repair and monitor the area.

☐ i. The down stream slope was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.

☑ g. Tree(s) were observed on the downstream slope. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage. 4/23/06

☐ h. Seepage/Ponding water was observed. Monitor and conduct further investigation to locate the source of water and extent of any possible hazardous or developing condition.

☐ i. Seepage was observed flowing and particles were observed to be removed by the flow. Take immediate action to stop the loss of soil from the embankment. Conduct further investigation to determine the underlining cause and take corrective action. Monitor the area.

☑ j. The slope was very steep, around a 1 to 1 slope, further study is required to verify slope stability. 4/23/06

☐ k. _____

Dam ID: OA-0045
HELEMANO 16 RESERVOIR

Inspection No: _____
Date: 04/03/06

8. Abutments/Toe:

Erosion: ☐ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☑ None Observed

Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☐ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☑ None Observed

Description: _____

Vegetation: ☐ None ☑ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees #_____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"

Description: _____

Seepage:

Seep Spot Number 1

☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☑ None Observed

☐ Flowing, Description: _____

Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____

Description: _____

Seep Spot Number 2

☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

☐ Flowing, Description: _____

Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____

Description: _____

Findings:

☑ a. The abutments/toe were not inspected. Not Accessible

☑ b. The abutments/toe appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.

☐ c. The abutments/toe appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.

☐ d. The abutments/toe appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

☐ e. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: _____

☐ f. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed, which requires maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____

☐ g. A crack was observed along the abutments/near the toe, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.

☐ h. The abutment/toe area was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.

☐ i. Tree(s) were observed along the abutment/toe. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.

☐ j. Seepage/Ponding water was observed. Monitor and conduct further investigation to locate the source of water and extent of any possible hazardous or developing condition.

☐ k. Seepage was observed flowing and particles were observed to be removed by the flow. Take immediate action to stop the loss of soil from the embankment. Conduct further investigation to determine the underlining cause and take corrective action. Monitor the area.

☐ l. _____

Dam ID: OA-0045
HELEMANO 16 RESERVOIR

Inspection No: _____
Date: 04/03/06

9. Outlet Works:

Culvert / Pipe

Type / Size: Valve Box into pipe (material unknown)

Culvert: ☐ Concrete ☐ Masonry ☐ unlined earth ☐ Other _____

Pipe: ☐ DIP ☐ Corrugated Metal ☐ PVC ☐ HDPE ☐ Concrete ☐ Other pipe type/size unknown

Control Type: ☐ Gate ☑ Valve ☐ Other _____

Location: ☐ Control on Upstream side ☐ Control on Downstream side

Seepage: ☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☑ None Observed

☐ Flowing, Description: _____

Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____

Description: _____

Findings:

☐ a. The outlet works were not inspected.

☐ b. The outlet works were not tested.

☑ c. The outlet works appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.

☐ d. The outlet works appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.

☐ e. The outlet works appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

☐ f. Seepage/Ponding water was observed. Conduct further investigation to locate the source of water and extent of any possible hazardous or developing condition.

☐ g. Seepage was observed flowing and particles were observed to be removed by the flow. Take immediate action to stop the loss of soil. Conduct further investigation to determine the underlining cause and take corrective action. Monitor the area. Failures caused by seepage/piping along the outlet conduit are very common and are considered to be a dangerous situation.

☐ h. Were not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.

☐ i. _____

☐ j. _____

Dam ID: OA-0045
HELEMANO 16 RESERVOIR

Inspection No: _____
Date: 04/03/06

10. Spillway:

Type: ☐ None ☐ Culvert/Pipe ☑ Channel
Description: Concrete Box Culvert
Dimension: 12' x 8' ft. Invert elevation: _____ ft. per staff gage
Slope Protection: ☐ None ☐ Grass ☐ Dumped Rock ☐ Fitted Rip Rap ☐ Grouted Rip Rap ☑ Concrete
☐ Defect in Protection: Description: _____
Approach: ☑ Clear ☐ High Veg. ☐ Trees ☐ Other: _____
Erosion: ☐ Scour ☐ Gully ☐ Headcut ☑ Not Observed ☐ Other: _____
Description: _____
Vegetation: ☑ None ☐ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees #_____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"
Description: _____

Findings:

☑ a. The Spillway appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☐ b. The Spillway appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ c. The Spillway appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

☐ d. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: _____
☐ e. The spillway approach was blocked. Clear approach.
☐ f. Severe scour erosion was observed which requires maintenance and/or repair.
Description: _____
☐ g. A headcut (vertical drop in channel due to erosion) was observed downstream of the spillway. Corrective action is required to prevent this problem from moving upstream.
☐ h. Trees are unacceptable in the spillway channel and approach. Take corrective action to address the woody vegetation problem and repair the damaged area.
☐ i. Unclear if spillway is adequately sized. Spillway should pass the probable maximum flood. Verify spillway capacity and take corrective action as required.
☐ j. _____

11. Down Stream Channel:

Name: Helemano 6
Downstream: ☐ Sump ☐ Open Area ☐ Un-Defined Drainage-way ☐ Defined Drainage-way ☑ Other Helemano 6
Items along Stream Bank: ☐ None ☐ Road ☐ Houses ☐ Town ☑ Not Inspected
Description: _____

Findings:

☑ a. The downstream channel was not inspected. Not Accessible
☐ b. The downstream channel appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☐ c. The downstream channel appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ d. The downstream channel appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

☐ e. _____

Dam ID: OA-0045 HELEMANO 16 RESERVOIR	Inspection No: _____ Date: 04/03/00

Additional Comments:

On the date of this limited visual inspection, there appeared to be no immediate threat to the safety of the dam. No assurance can be made regarding the dam's condition after this date. Subsequent adverse weather and other factors may affect the dam's condition.

Limitations and Intent of this Dam Safety Inspection:

This Dam Safety Inspection was conducted to assess the general overall condition of the reservoir/dam, identify visible deficiencies, and recommend areas of for monitoring, additional investigative studies and corrective actions. The inspection is based only on visible features/areas of the dam on the day of inspection. This inspection is not a formal phase I or phase II dam safety inspection and does not include a review or evaluation from each specialist of an inspection team, such as a geologists, civil, geotechnical, structural, or hydraulics engineer. The owner should verify the findings of this report and take corrective actions. The owner may submit to the State alternative corrective actions that are certified by a licensed professional engineer in the State of Hawaii experienced in the design and construction of dams. This inspection does not relieve the owner/operator from their responsibility to conduct routine inspections, maintenance, repairs, modifications, monitoring, documentation, and/or investigative studies. The inspection was conducted under the authority of the Hawaii Revised Statures Chapter 179D, and Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title 13, Chapter 190, titled "Dams and Reservoirs". Questions regarding this inspection should be forwarded to the Hawaii State Dam Safety Program; PO Box 373; Honolulu, Hawaii 96809; Ph. (808) 587-0236.

Revised: Dec. 1, 2003